



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,544	12/31/2003	Louis A. Lippincott	P17420	5576
59796	7590	12/23/2010		
INTEL CORPORATION c/o CPA Global P.O. BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER HASSAN, AURANGZEB	
			ART UNIT 2182	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

heather.ladamson@intel.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,544

Applicant(s)

LIPPINCOTT, LOUIS A.

Examiner

AURANGZEB HASSAN

Art Unit

2182

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,9,23-25,27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,9,23-25,27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/15/2010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/15/10 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 9, 23 – 25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Faroudja (US Patent Number 5,151,783).

4. As per claims 1, 9 and 23, Faroudja teaches a method, apparatus and machine-readable medium comprising: receiving video into a video display device (television system, column 3, lines 44 – 51); storing, by at least one processor (detail processor 38, figure 3a), the video into a memory, upon determining (detecting carrier modulation is

the determining of the mode, column 4, lines 3 – 15) that the video display device is in a storage mode (storage mode stores into magnetic recording medium, column 3, lines 45 – 51 and shown as done by processor in column 6, lines 37 – 46), wherein the video stored into the memory is to be subsequently retrieved for display on a video display coupled to the video display device (86, figure 3b); and performing enhanced image processing on the video with the at least one processor, upon determining that the video display device is in an image processing mode (image processing by image detail processor 38, column 7, lines 22 – 32), wherein the video display device is to operate in the image processing mode, upon determining that video is not being stored into the memory or the video stored in the memory is not being retrieved for display on a video display (video not displayed if not functioning through the memory, via modes in the decoder, 60 and 102, figure 4, which is the processing mode of no data).

5. As per claims 2 and 24, Faroudja teaches a method and machine-readable medium further comprising compressing (compression takes place at 42, figure 3a, which is before storing which occurs at path 12, figure 3b), by the at least one processor, the video prior to storing the video into the memory, upon determining that the video display device is within the storage mode.

6. As per claims 3 and 25, Faroudja teaches a method and machine-readable medium wherein compressing, by the at least one processor, the video comprises performing frame reduction on the video, by a first processor of the at least one

processor (frame reduction known, column 1, lines 34 – 37, and performing in the modification of the recurrent picture frame rate, column 3, lines 52 – 63)

7. As per claims 5 and 27, Faroudja teaches a method and machine-readable medium wherein performing enhanced image processing on the video comprises performing a ghost reduction operation (ghost reduction column 5, lines 55 – 67).

8. As per claims 6 and 28, Faroudja teaches a method and machine-readable medium wherein performing enhanced image processing on the video comprises performing a noise reduction operation (noise reduction 70, figure 3b, column 8, lines 38 – 58).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/2009 presented in the Appeal Brief have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner has addressed the Arguments and has presented them again for better understanding of the position upheld. Furthermore the Examiner has considered IDS and acknowledges the pertinent prior art that applies to the claim limitations and suggests in order to enhance compact prosecution the Applicant differentiate the claimed invention to overcome the instant relied upon prior art as well as the extrinsic evidence not relied upon in the IDS. The Applicant argues Faroudja does not teach the claim limitation of "wherein the video display device is to operate in the image processing mode, upon determining that video

is not being stored into the memory or the video stored in the memory is not being retrieved for display on a video display."

With regards to the Applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant argues that the Faroudja does not the particulars of the image processing mode and has cited points from the Examiners citation including the decoders and functionality of no data present on the processing mode. The Examiner has clearly pointed out limitations that handle the limitations necessitated by the claims. The primary component argued by the Applicant is the image processing mode which operates upon determining *either "that video is not being stored into the memory or the video stored in the memory is not being retrieved for display on a video display."* The Examiner has understood the claims to necessitate that the image processing mode is operational with either of the above mentioned *"video is not being stored"* or *"video ... not being retrieved"* and the image processing mode does not require both. Furthermore the claims recite a storage mode however the Examiner makes note that the storage mode has no direct impact on the image processing mode in any capacity. The image processing mode is an independent functionality directly dependent on the said video data. This concept of data storage independence in the image processor relates back to how Faroudja handles its image processing functionality. The Examiner clearly stated that the image processing mode is when the functionality is allowed by the image processor 38 of figure 3a which in turn processes data to the data path 12 which leads to figure 3b. In the case the data is not stored it is processed and passed on to the decoder 60, figure 3b which allows for further processing to display, figure 4.

Furthermore the citation provided to better understand the storage mode also teaches not storing by Faroudja which states in column 3, lines 45 - 51 that there is a medium utilized for passing the video data. Clearly one of ordinary skill would recognize Faroudja teaches limitations of an independent image processing mode as necessitated by the claim limitations.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AURANGZEB HASSAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8625. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2182

AH

/Eron J Sorrell/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2182

December 20, 2010